

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 20, 22, and 23 are independent.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-5, 20, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-5, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 states that “previous stage unit circuit”, “following stage unit circuit”, and “final stage unit circuit” do not clearly indicate which part of the filter circuit they refer to. Claim 1 has been amended to recite explicit relationships relative to the “first stage unit circuit”, “at least one second stage unit circuit”, and “final stage unit circuit”. Applicants submit that the claim is definite.

The rejection of claim 2 states that the claim has the same problems as claim 1, and further states that the phrase “previous stage” is unclear. Similar to claim 1, claim 2 has also been amended to recite explicit relationships between unit circuits. Applicants submit that the claim is definite.

The rejections of claims 3, 4, and 5 state that they each have the same problem as claim 1. Claims 3-5 have been amended to recite explicit

relationships between unit circuits. Applicants submit that the claims are definite.

The rejection of claim 20 states that the phrase “wherein at least one of the correlation ... a final stage” is unclear. Claim 20 has been amended to define “final stage” in the preamble. Applicants submit that the claim is definite.

The rejection of claim 22 states that the occurrences of the phrase “previous stage” do not make clear whether they are referring to the same stage. Claim 22 has been amended to explicitly recite a relationship with the “at least one of said correlation computing unit circuits”. Applicants submit that the claim is definite.

The rejection of claim 23 states that it has the same problem as claim 22. Claim 23 has also been amended to explicitly recite a relationship with the “at least one of said correlation computing unit circuits”. Applicants submit that the claim is definite.


CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222), to conduct an **interview** in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 
Charles Gorenstein
Reg. No. 29,271

RWD
CG/RWD/ph/fjl
(703) 205-8000
1248-505P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000